

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 051 398

VT 013 221

TITLE Cooperative Day of Planning II.
INSTITUTION National Advisory Council on Vocational Education,
Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 2 May 70
NOTE 40p.; Report on the Joint Meeting of the State and
National Advisory Councils on Vocational Education
(2nd, Washington, D.C. May 1-2, 1970)

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Advisory Committees, *Cooperative Planning,
Educational Planning, Educational Problems, National
Organizations, *Planning Meetings, *Program
Planning, Speeches, State Agencies, *Vocational
Education
IDENTIFIERS *National Advisory Council on Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

The Second Joint Meeting of the State and National Advisory Councils on Vocational Education was held in Washington, D.C. on May 1-2, 1970. Attended by representatives of all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, the meeting dealt with the Councils' mutual activities and problems. Of particular importance to the assembled group were resolutions setting goals for evaluations by State Councils, clarifying the independent status of the Councils, and requesting early funding for education programs. This report summarizes the main areas of concern of the meeting and includes texts of all major resolutions dealt with, as well as summaries of the discussion on them. Finally, the report includes the texts of the speeches delivered at the meeting and selections from the questions following each speaker's remarks. (GB)

ED051398

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR
ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF
VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECES-
SARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY.

COOPERATIVE DAY OF PLANNING II

A Report on the Second Joint Meeting of the State and National
Advisory Councils on Vocational Education, May 1-2, 1970
Washington, D.C.

COOPERATIVE DAY OF PLANNING II

A Report on the Second Joint Meeting of the State and
National Advisory Councils on Vocational
Education May 1-2, 1970

CONTENTS

Introduction

Summary of Major Resolutions Acted Upon

- . Suggested Evaluation Goals for State Advisory Councils
- . Early Funding for Education Programs
- . Independence of State Advisory Councils

Summary of Discussion on Areas of Mutual Concern

- . State, Regional, and National Cooperation Among Advisory Councils
- . State Advisory Councils - Funding Questions
- . Creating a Positive Image for Vocational Education
- . DECA Speaks to State and National Councils - Joint Meetings Planned

Texts of Speeches and Summary of Related Discussion

- . Remarks by Congressman Albert Quie (R-Minn.)
- . Remarks by Mr. Hugh Calkins, Chairman, NACVE
- . Remarks by Dr. James Abert, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Evaluation and Monitoring, HEW
- . Concluding Remarks by Dr. Calvin Dellefield, Executive Director, NACVE

List of Delegates in Attendance

COOPERATIVE DAY OF PLANNING II

A Report on the Joint Meeting of the State and
National Advisory Councils on Vocational Education, May 1-2,
1970, Washington, D.C.

Introduction

The State and National Advisory Councils on Vocational Education were created by Congress through the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968. The Councils were set up as independent boards to study, plan, and evaluate vocational education on the local, State, and national levels. They were established to work with and supplement the work of the State boards of education, while always leaving the administrative responsibilities to the State boards. At the time of their creation, the State and National Advisory Councils agreed that arrangements should be made for extensive mutual cooperation, not only with the State boards, but among the Advisory Councils themselves. One of the crucial means for achieving this cooperation and providing a vehicle for the exchange of information and ideas has been the biannual joint meeting of the State and National Advisory Councils.

The Second Joint Meeting of the State and National Advisory Councils on Vocational Education was held in Washington, D.C. on May 1-2, 1970. Attended by representatives of all fifty States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, the meeting dealt with the Councils' mutual activities and problems. Speakers included Congressman Albert Quie (R-Minn.), Mr. Hugh Calkins, Chairman, National Advisory Council, and Dr. James G. Abert, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Evaluation and Monitoring, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Of particular importance to the assembled group were resolutions setting goals for evaluations by State Councils, clarifying the independent status of the Councils, and requesting early funding for education programs.

This report intends to summarize the main areas of concern of the meeting. It includes texts of all major resolutions dealt with, as well as summaries of the discussion on them. Finally, the report includes the texts of the speeches delivered at the meeting and selections from the questions following each speaker's remarks. It is my hope that this report will be useful to you in following the progress of the Advisory Councils and of the issues with which they are concerned.

Calvin Dellefield
Executive Director
National Advisory Council
on Vocational Education

COOPERATIVE DAY OF PLANNING II

Summary of Major Resolutions Acted Upon

1a

Suggested Evaluation Goals for State Advisory Councils

One of the major items of business for the Council representatives was the consideration of the suggested evaluation goals for State Advisory Councils. Proposals for the development of these goals had grown out of the State Councils' meeting in Ohio and had been previously distributed to the group. Mr. John Briscoe, Executive Director of the New York State Advisory Council and Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on Evaluation, reviewed the Committee's work and its attempts to develop a tentative frame of reference for evaluation which would allow the States to maintain flexibility, while still contributing to an analysis on the national level. Mr. Briscoe explained that the Bureau of Adult, Vocational, and Technical Education had presented a handbook to be used as a suggested format for evaluation. This was rejected by the Ad Hoc Committee, however, which asked BAVTE to develop instead a set of questions to indicate how each of the five goals might be implemented. The questions subsequently developed by the Bureau were approved by the Committee as an optional appendix to its suggested goals. The five suggested goals submitted by the Committee for the delegates' approval are:

- . Evaluation should focus on the State goals and priorities set forth in the State plan.
- . Evaluation should look into all parts of the human resources development program of the State.
- . Evaluation should focus upon the effects the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 had upon the State in the year under review.
- . Evaluation should focus upon the effectiveness with which the people and their needs are served.
- . Evaluation should consider the employment opportunities within the State and the vocational education services provided to meet those opportunities.

Led by members of the Ad Hoc Committee,* the delegates to the meeting were divided into round table discussion groups to consider these five suggested goals. Reports by the discussion group leaders indicated that the groups accepted the goals and endorsed the idea of broad direction in evaluation as long as the States' flexibility is preserved. There was also general agreement that the appendices should be regarded as advisory. Several additions and suggestions regarding the evaluation goals were made by the discussion groups. These include:

- . Evaluation should focus on end results, i.e. on the short and long-term effectiveness of programs.
- . Vocational education planning and evaluation should take into consideration the ideas of employers, interested youth groups, and teachers.

- . Goal 1 should include: "How well does the State plan address itself to the goals? Are the objectives realistic?"
- . Goal 1 should include: "To what extent was the Council consulted in the development of the State plan?"
- . Goal 2: Part 3 should read, "What programs, services, and activities have been implemented or are planned regarding joint efforts between public vocational education and the non-educational social institutions and agencies in the State concerned with the development of human resources? What pay-offs have resulted from these activities?"
- . Goal 2 should be clarified and "human resources development programs" should be defined.
- . Goal 4 should include: "Programs should be vocational in direction and pre-vocational in nature."
- . Goal 4: Part 2 should read, "...high quality programs to end dropouts..." rather than, "...for dropouts and potential dropouts..."
- . Goal 4: Part 3 should include the concept of what actions are being taken to integrate new programs, not just articulate them.
- . Goal 4: Part 4 should clarify whether employer satisfaction with graduates and graduates' satisfaction with programs refer to a short, moderate, or long-term analysis.
- . Goal 5: Part 2 should underscore the question, "How many job opportunities are going unfilled because of the shortage of skilled manpower?"
- . Evaluation should include analyses of the effectiveness of the Office of Education, its Divisions, and Bureaus.
- . Evaluation should focus upon the valid use of manpower data and projections, Department of Labor employment information, etc., and should include analyses of all areas of vocational education (i.e. military, manpower, etc.).
- . Non-education-oriented training programs such as MDTA and NAB should be examined for possible duplication of effort with vocational education programs.
- . Evaluation should deal with the image of vocational education.
- . Evaluation should deal with the ability of the States to enact their State plans, in relationship to the shortages of time and money.
- . Evaluation should include the effectiveness of teacher institutions, guidance counselors, and the dispersion of vocational education programs throughout all educational levels.

- . Evaluation should include an analysis of the activities of local advisory committees and the utilization of local functionary advisory committees.
- . A Committee of the States should review a summary of the 1970 State Evaluation Reports; an Ad Hoc Committee should use this review as a basis for future developments in reporting procedures.
- . An Ad Hoc Committee composed of representatives of the State Advisory Councils and the National Council should study ways to direct some input into the procedures for the development of State plans. Such a Committee could work with the National Advisory Council's Subcommittee which is currently studying this problem.
- . The format should be changed to allow the evaluation package to be easily separated. The new format should be as follows:
 - . transmittal letter
 - . summary statement regarding the recommended goals
 - . areas of evaluation
 - . Goal I - items evaluated, findings, conclusions, recommendations
 - . Goal II- same
 - . etc.

Following the presentation by the discussion leaders and comments on the suggestions and additions listed above, it was moved that the Suggested Evaluation Goals (Working Paper Number Three) be accepted as written as guidance to the State Advisory Councils in the preparation of an evaluative report. It was further moved that before being issued, the Working Paper be redrafted to include the suggested format for evaluation outlined above. Both motions were carried. The suggested goals passed by the group will be presented to the Commissioner, who has the authority to distribute them to the States.

The Ad Hoc Committee on Evaluation, which had prepared the goals, was discontinued with the thanks of the group for its efforts. Work on coordination and development of State plans, new formats for these plans, and evaluations will be continued, however, under the auspices of the National Advisory Council's Committee on State Plans.

* Members of the Ad Hoc Committee on Evaluation: Mr. George McGorman, Executive Secretary, Delaware State Advisory Council; Mr. William Nagel, Executive Director, Illinois State Advisory Council; Mr. Robert Hewlett, Administrative Consultant, Indiana State Advisory Council; Mr. Jerry Enright, Consultant, Minnesota State Advisory Council; Mr. Andy Moynihan, Executive Director, New Hampshire State Advisory Council; Mr. John Briscoe, Executive Director, New York State Advisory Council; Mr. Joe Clary, Executive Director, North Carolina State Advisory Council; Mr. Warren Weiler, Executive

Director, Ohio State Advisory Council; Mrs. Caroline Hughes, Secretary, Oklahoma State Advisory Council; Mr. Robert White, Executive Director, South Carolina State Advisory Council; Mr. William Harrison, Executive Director, Tennessee State Advisory Council; Dr. Richard G. Allen, National Advisory Council, Mr. Charles Nichols, National Advisory Council, Dr. Jack Michie, National Advisory Council, and Dr. Luis Morton, National Advisory Council.

Early Funding of Education Programs

At the regional meeting of the New England States, held in Durham, New Hampshire on March 13-14, the question of late funding and the problems it presents were discussed. In several States, for example, badly needed money is being turned back because there is no time to adequately plan for its expenditure. Congress is aware of the problem, but additional efforts to inform individual Congressmen must be made if something is to be done. Therefore, the New England States presented the conference with a resolution requesting early funding for education programs. The resolution reads:

WHEREAS, state FY budgets for education have to be established well in advance of the convening of State Legislative bodies;

WHEREAS, local FY education budgets utilizing state funds have to be established in advance of state budgets for education;

AND, WHEREAS, federal FY funding has traditionally occurred six months to a year after the state and local governments have had to finalize their budgets, and where this in turn destroys any effective planning for the efficient utilization of Federal funds by the State and Local governments;

IT IS, THEREFORE, RESOLVED: That the Chairman and Representatives of the State Advisory Councils, and they do hereby, urge Congress to appropriate funds for education a FY in advance of the FY in which these funds will be expended.

The resolution was carried by the unanimous vote of those present, and will be presented to members of Congress.

Independence of State Advisory Councils

Much of the discussion following Congressman Quie's speech, and throughout the two-day meeting, centered around the problems which State Advisory

Councils have encountered in maintaining their independence from the State boards. Many representatives expressed particular concern over the State boards' attempts to regulate the Councils' fiscal matters. In response to this problem, the National Advisory Council at its April 24-25 meeting adopted a resolution requesting a clarification of the Rules and Regulations to clearly acknowledge the independence of the State Councils. Dr. Michie, a member of the National Council, asked that the joint meeting of the State and National Advisory Councils adopt the same resolution. The resolution, which was carried unanimously by those present, reads:

Sections 102.26 and 102.153 of the Rules and Regulations have been misinterpreted in some States. It is recommended, therefore, that these sections be modified in such a manner as to clearly define the independence of the council and point out that State boards have no regulatory power over councils. In acting as fiscal agents, State boards have no authority to set parameters for the expenditure of council funds. This responsibility rests solely with the council.

The resolution will be presented to the Office of Education, which is presently working on revisions of the Rules and Regulations.

In addition, it was suggested that the State Councils make a list of the fiscal, procedural, and statutory restrictions which make it difficult for them to carry out their functions effectively. This material would go to the National Council which, working through an Ad Hoc Committee of volunteers from the States, would review the material and look for areas of concern which are common to many States. Once returned to the States, this material could be used to give members of Congress an indication of which issues are of major importance to the State Councils. This suggested procedure was put in the form of a motion, which reads:

In response to Congressman Quie's invitation for information regarding the operation of the State Advisory Councils and their functional relationship to State Boards and State Departments of Education, the following has been suggested:

- 1) That a few minutes be set aside in the round table discussion period to make an inventory of procedural, fiscal, and statutory matters that appear to inhibit the role of the State Advisory Councils.

- 2) That this inventory be recorded and turned over to an ad hoc committee for assessment. This ad hoc committee will then develop a report for submission to each State Council Chairman for review in order that each State Council may convey to its Congressman those matters that have substantial and overriding concern to the aggregate interests of the State Councils in their work.

The motion was passed unanimously by those present.

COOPERATIVE DAY OF PLANNING II

Summary of Discussion on Areas of Mutual Concern

6a

State, Regional, and National Cooperation Among Advisory Councils

At the joint meeting of the State and National Advisory Councils in November, the National Advisory Council was requested to carry out four main services for the States. The first was to provide a means of communication between the States and Washington to keep the States informed of developments in Congressional activities and attitudes. This has been done through the NACVE News, the National Council's monthly newsletter. The second request was that the National Council seek ways to secure additional funds for the States. A resolution to this effect was passed at the November meeting, and resulted in the passage of the Allen Amendment, giving the State Councils more money this year. The third area of concern in November was that the National Council find some way to insure the independence of the State Councils. In response to this, a Congressional Report was issued by both the House and Senate committees, interpreting the responsibilities of the State Councils. Finally, the States requested that another meeting be held in six months. This resulted in the May 1-2 conference.

Several representatives from the State Councils expressed a desire for the continued coordination of efforts among the States from some central organization. It was suggested that representatives from each region, for example, serve with the National Council on a special board to coordinate State activities. Dr. Dellefield explained that the National Council does not have the responsibility for directing the States, but is available to assist them in whatever way possible. Another suggestion was that an Association of Councils on Vocational Education be established, to which each State Council would be invited to belong. Annual dues would be based on a certain percentage allocated to each State Council, and funds would be used to hire a staff to serve all the State Councils. The staff would be under the supervision of the Executive Director of the National Council, but would be responsive to the wishes of the State Councils. It was moved that an Ad Hoc Committee be set up to study this proposal, but no action was taken on the motion.

The National Council was asked to interpret the legal requirements and limitations on membership on State Advisory Councils. Dr. Dellefield explained that the law leaves a great deal of flexibility in this area. While the law requires that certain groups be represented on the State Council, it in no way limits the Council to only these representatives. The Governor, or whoever appoints the Council in each State, may appoint as many people as he deems necessary in addition to those required by law to serve on the Council. Thus, it is perfectly acceptable, and encouraged, to have representatives from private schools, youth organizations, etc. serving on the State Councils.

There has been an increasing trend toward regional planning for vocational education programs. Three groups held regional meetings lately which were attended by Dr. Dellefield. The New England Region is engaged in several cooperative endeavours. Both the Rocky Mountain States and representatives from the Southern States have made plans for joint efforts and regular meetings. The

Midwestern States have also announced their intention to form a regional group.

Commenting on this trend, Dr. Dellefield stated, "The more cooperation that happens in an area, the better the vocational education which our youngsters receive is going to be. This is especially true as our population continues to become more and more mobile. I certainly encourage the continued development of regional groupings."

Mr. Charles Nichols, Chairman of the National Advisory Council's Committee on Services to the Disadvantaged, announced that he would like to secure the names of the people on each State Advisory Council who are responsible for dealing with the disadvantaged. In this way, the National Council will be able to have a group of resource people in all areas of the country for securing information on programs for the disadvantaged.

State Advisory Councils - Funding Questions

Many of the States expressed interest in determining whether the Tydings Amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1969 applied to State Advisory Councils. Dr. Dellefield explained that it did, and that money appropriated during fiscal 1970 may be used during the entire fiscal 1971. This money does not have to be obligated before June 30.

Dr. Dellefield also explained that the State board may allocate any funds that are available to the States for the use of the State Advisory Councils. In many States, the State board has provided additional funds or has paid for housing, clerical expenses, etc., thus leaving the Council's money to be used exclusively for technical assistance.

Creating a Positive Image for Vocational Education

The National Advisory Council, recognizing that up to now vocational education has not had a positive public image, has initiated a pilot project to study attitudes toward vocational education, and to find out if spot radio and television announcements, along with intensive public relations efforts, are able to influence these attitudes.

As part of this project, Portland, Cleveland, and Atlanta have contributed funds for an expert to work with local people in the development of a public image program. California has recently completed a number of 30-second spots for television and radio to promote interest in vocational education, and Ohio, Texas, and many other States are looking into this type of project to see if they might participate, either independently or cooperatively.

DECA Speaks to State and National Councils - Joint Meetings Planned

Mr. Dick Anderson, representing the Distributive Education Clubs of America, spoke to the conference about the need for Advisory Councils to become familiar

with all aspects of vocational education, including the role which youth organizations can play in the development of vocational education programs. He asked the Councils to use their influence on the State and national levels to assure quality in vocational education programs. Mr. Anderson also suggested that the youth organizations be included in State and local conferences and that representatives from the Advisory Councils participate in the meetings and activities of the youth groups. In this context, Mr. Anderson invited the representatives to attend the National Leadership Conference to be held in San Antonio on April 17, 1971 to celebrate DECA's 25th anniversary.

In response to this invitation, it was moved that the State Advisory Councils hold their meeting next year in conjunction with the 25th anniversary celebration of DECA in San Antonio. The motion was carried unanimously. It was further agreed that the joint meeting of the State and National Advisory Councils scheduled for the fall be held on November 6-7. A committee made up of volunteers will select the site for that meeting.

COOPERATIVE DAY OF PLANNING II

Remarks Before the Joint Meeting of the State and National Advisory
Councils on Vocational Education

CONGRESSMAN ALBERT QUIE (R-MINN.)

Remarks Before the Joint Meeting of the State and
National Advisory Councils on Vocational Education

I. Purposes of the State Advisory Council

The first point to be made is that the Act gives these advisory councils real and quite specific functions: (1) to consult with the State boards in the preparation of annual and long-range program plans; (2) to evaluate the effectiveness of vocational-technical programs within the State (at least annually); and (3) to make a report of findings and evaluations to the U.S. Commissioner of Education and to the National Advisory Council, and, of course, to make recommendations to the State board.

Clearly -- while the advisory council is carefully removed from administrative responsibility for programs -- these are the functions of an independent council with significant responsibilities. The Congress intended that these councils have genuine independent "clout".

"Why?" one may ask (as many State boards did ask) is this outside advice needed? Many reasons could be given. First, there is the feeling that any activity benefits from an independent and impartial appraisal. Second, there is the obvious need to help bring vocational-technical education into the mainstream of the total educational effort. Third, there is the absolute necessity to relate vocational-technical education to the developing employment needs of every State. Fourth, there is the long-range goal of building a wider constituency for vocational education and for creating a greater public appreciation of occupational education. This last may be the most important of all, and a State advisory council which is broadly enough structured could make a significant contribution.

The creation of an independent advisory council was never intended as a reflection upon the performance of State boards or of vocational educators. Quite the contrary, it was a recognition of the essential place of vocational education in our educational system and of its crucial importance in achieving vital social and economic goals. As was stated when the 1968 bill was reported by our Committee: "There should be a renewed sense of urgency about the need for a modern structure of occupational education which will meet the needs of the total population in all parts of the country."

II. Independent Councils Required

The Act sets up an advisory council which is to be independent of the State board. This point of view was strongly held in the House of Representatives and it prevailed. For example, the Senate bill originally provided that the council be appointed by the State board, but the House bill mandated appointment by the Governor of the State. The House version was modified only to the extent that if the Board members are elected they may appoint the council. Just

this year there was a further modification to permit appointment of the council by a State board which is elected by the State Legislature. (This applies only in New York). Still, the intent is to relate the State council appointments to a degree of political accountability. I believe it would be better not to have appointment by the State board in any instance, and feel the Governor ought to appoint a State Advisory Council in every case just as we require the President to appoint the national council, not the Commissioner of Education or the Secretary of H.E.W.

The other provisions which provide for independent operation are the separate arrangement for funding the State councils and for selection of staff by the councils, and the power to make direct reports to the national level without the concurrence of the State board.

III. Funding for State Councils

Regrettably, the intention of the Act has not been carried out with regard to funding. Section 104(c) of the Act clearly authorizes the Commissioner to use the full appropriations for parts B and C of the Act in order to pay for each State council "an amount equal to the reasonable amounts expended by it in carrying out its functions," and places a minimum of \$50,000 and a maximum of \$150,000 for any State.

Typically, the Bureau of the Budget and the Appropriations Committee have treated this as a line item to be separately funded. Accordingly, the councils have \$2.8 million (reduced to \$2.38 million) for fiscal 1970 and there was budgeted and approved by the House \$2.38 million in 1971. This is not even sufficient to provide the minimum \$50,000 in most States (only a few larger States get more than that, and small States get far less).

This treatment frustrates one of the key provisions of the 1968 Act.

IV. Some Thoughts on the Role of the Councils

The Act requires representation on the councils of a variety of educational interests and levels: community and junior colleges, other higher education, postsecondary vocational schools and adult education, comprehensive secondary schools, local school boards, the physically handicapped, school systems with large concentrations of disadvantaged, etc., etc. This may well weight the councils far too heavily with educators, as opposed to persons in industry, labor and such professional fields as economics. But there can be an initial advantage in this, because one of the major problems with vocational-technical

education is to end its comparative isolation from the rest of the academic community. This also is a two-way street -- because it is essential that general and academic educators (1) start to really know something about occupational education and (2) stop treating it as something different from and inferior to other education. There is plenty of reason to fear that if rapid progress isn't made in improving the place of occupational education within the educational community we are not going to be able to improve the public understanding of education for work.

A State council structured in accordance with the Act should be uniquely qualified to undertake this task.

The improvement of the place of occupational education in the educational structure is not an end in itself -- it is only a part of the means by which we seek to accomplish a critical objective: to assure that every person going through our educational system has a genuine opportunity to learn to earn a good living in a needed occupation. To the extent that we are failing to do this our educational system is failing and we must face that squarely.

The State councils should take the broadest possible view of their role in developing occupational education. You should look not only at vocational education, but at all of education in the context of meeting the occupational needs of all of the people. You ought to take a hard look at such fields as counseling and guidance and to see whether or not children at an early age have access to occupational guidance; they ought to take a very hard look at all of secondary education to determine just what it is children are being prepared to do after graduation; and they ought to examine post-secondary education to determine just how adequately it serves the needs of the total population.

This is an enormous task and obviously it cannot all be undertaken at one time. They might consider establishing lines of communications between State advisory councils so that the work of one council might be used by another without duplicating the effort; they certainly ought to be appraised of the progress in other States and of ideas developed in other States which have produced good results. I am saying this because I do not feel that you should use only the National Council as your clearing house, nor should you depend on the U.S. Office of Education to be the clearing house of items between states. Just as the Education Commissions of the States have now been developed to permit the State Departments of Education and the communities to communicate with each other and bring a "teamwork" approach to dealing with the Federal Government, so I believe you need to develop that same type of organizational structure.

It may prove useful -- to the extent the council lacks certain expertise in its membership -- to consult as widely as possible with economists, industrialists, labor leaders, public relations people, and others whose special knowledge can be enlisted in this effort. An imaginative council should be

able to vastly increase the intellectual resources available to it, and in the process develop a far wider interest in occupational education amongst leading citizens of the State.

It was the hope of the Congress that independent State councils would develop into one of the most effective instruments for change and progress in occupational education. The potential is there if we all keep working together to realize it.

Before I close, I want to point out one other bit of information. The United States has been dependent on growth industry, especially since World War II. I believe vocational education is the only growth industry other than pre-school training and development. In fact, I doubt there is any area of need for expansion and development in education other than vocational and the pre-school areas. So far, I doubt we really know how to contend with stability and maturity in some of the other areas of education. Higher education and graduate levels of education are just becoming aware of the fact we are meeting our needs, at least on a general basis. The Department of Labor recently indicated that by 1975 the supply of college graduates and the demand for college graduates in this country will be on par with each other.

Dr. Allen Cartter, Chancellor of New York University, had indicated in a recent speech, as a result of his studies, he has come to the conclusion, "Our graduate schools--may be entering a long period of overproductivity and excess capacity."

He also pointed out that it is not true that college campuses would be overburdened if the same percentage of non-white high school graduates entered colleges as did whites. He said this year, the total freshman enrollment might have been only 50,000 greater if the percentages had been the same in the white and non-white racial groups. This would have meant only 2-2-1/2% larger enrollment.

He also looked at the total pool of high school graduates who now constitute 82% of that age group. The college age grew at a rate of 5-1/2% over the last seven years. However, looking at the next five years (1970-1975), the growth will average only 2-1/2% a year. The next five years (1975-1980) the growth will only be one-half of one percent a year and in the early 1980's it will decline nearly a percent a year. By 1985, the number of 18 year olds will be 500,000 or 12% below the 1978 level. This is based, as you know, on children who are already born.

That is not the case with vocational education. In fact, I believe we must change our stress in education, whereas, at the present, a first grade teacher and subsequent teachers feel they are successful if a child goes on to finally secure a baccalaureate degree. However, not much more than 20% of the college age group actually achieves this.

Instead, I believe the first grade teacher and also subsequent teachers should feel they are a success only if they succeed in a goal of providing

every child with a marketable skill before they leave their formal education, or the tool to secure that skill from private industry.

This means that we must not only do better with the dropouts from high school who amount to 750,000 a year, or about 6% of the seventeen year olds today, but also with the functional illiterates who total about 1 percent of the 17 year olds. We should point out here that all dropouts are not functional illiterates and as you can see from the figures, all functional illiterates are not dropouts. This means that one of your goals in evaluation is not to provide the kind of information that we so often hear about the quality of general education using the number of dropouts who can go on to college as an indication of success, but instead -- how many of them can read; how many of them can handle arithmetic problems. Only then, when we evaluate the end result, will we provide the kind of occupational education for that 80% who do not secure the baccalaureate degree.

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS TO CONGRESSMAN QUIE

Question: Many of us feel that there is a duplication of effort between vocational education programs and Department of Labor manpower programs. How does Congress feel about this?

Response: I can't speak for Congress as a whole, but I feel that the only way that you are going to coordinate the effort is to put all the manpower programs in the Department of Labor, and all the education programs in the Office of Education. Together with such institutions as the National Science Foundation, and the Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, these programs should all be coordinated through a cabinet level Secretary of Education and Manpower. I doubt that we will ever get good coordination on the local level until the Federal government shows its willingness to coordinate efforts on the national level. The proposed State Advisory Council on Manpower is a perfect example of duplication; it would be doing exactly what you are doing. I would like to organize the system so that the same individuals work in the total area of manpower and occupational education.

Question: What are the prospects for future funding of vocational programs?

Response: I think that the prospects for annual increases in vocational education funds are pretty good. For instance, in 1969, vocational education funds totalled \$293,216,000; in 1970, subtracting the two per cent reduction, they jumped to \$419,046,000. The House action this year increases the figure to \$490,446,000 for fiscal 1971. I think increases of this kind are going to continue. What I really would like to see, however, is forward funding. I doubt that we'll ever reach the point where schools can plan to use Federal money wisely, until we have forward funding, and the confidence that there will always be forward funding. It should not be an impossible thing to achieve, as many of my colleagues make it out to be. Aid to airports has always been provided through forward funding, and if it can be done for airports, it can be done for schools as well.

In this context, I am particularly concerned by the Appropriation Committee's comments in this last appropriations bill, where it states that early funding is more important than forward funding. Now, early funding is better than late funding, but forward funding is even more important. I think it would be most helpful if groups like the Emergency Committee for Full Funding would work as hard for forward funding as they did for full funding.

Question: Could you please give us some information on Congress's intent with regard to the independence of State Advisory Councils?

Response: I know that practically every member of the House Education and Labor Committee feels very strongly that the State Advisory Council ought to be independent from the State board, in fiscal as well as in policy matters. You will not be carrying out the legislative intent if you permit State departments of education or State departments of vocational education to dominate your proceedings. The lack of effectiveness of many advisory councils in the past was due, at least in part, to the fact that the State boards actually appointed the council, worked out its Agenda, and made the recommendations. So when we talk about your being an independent group, we mean just that.

Try to pool your comments about problems regarding the independence of State Advisory Councils, and then write a letter to me, to Lloyd Meeds of Washington, and to Roman Pucinski of Illinois. Then we can see if we want to change the statute to guarantee your independence, or whether we'll call the Office of Education before the Committee. One problem I do think you should be aware of, however, is that after our experience with the complete independence of the Community Action Agencies under OEO, many of us are reluctant to leave any council totally independent, i.e. with no representation from the appropriate State agencies. At the same time, we do not want you to be dominated by those agencies.

Question: Our set asides have been cutting into our regular programs. Is there any chance of getting an additional appropriation to take care of that 25% which is tied up in set asides?

Response: I suppose there could be, but I wouldn't be in favor of it. I have felt all along that there has not been enough expended for vocational education for the handicapped and the disadvantaged. Now set asides can run into the problem of segregating the handicapped and, in some cases, the disadvantaged also. This is wrong and should be avoided. I don't think it would be wise, however, to have a line item or a special program by itself for these groups. I feel very strongly that there should at least be a program which reflects a percentage of the basic grant.

Question: How narrowly or how broadly should we interpret the term "evaluation"?

Response: I think this is an issue that you'll have to resolve. The Congress had little discussion on exactly what type of evaluation you would be doing. I recognize that you must have the assistance of the National Council and the U.S. Office of Education to get some uniformity in your evaluations so that they can be used to get a national picture. One thing that I can say about your evaluation efforts, is that Congress is looking for information on end results. We don't just want to know the number of people who have completed a vocational course. If none of them have remained on the job, if the employer has been unable to use them, they weren't trained

properly. That's the type of information in which we are interested.

You are also required by law to distribute your findings. By this we mean that the widest possible audience should see your reports so that public opinion will be affected. We also require that your reports be sent to the National Council so that they can be published on a national level and will have clout on Congress and on the Administration.

HUGH CALKINS, CHAIRMAN, NACVE

Remarks Before the Joint Meeting of the State
and National Advisory Councils on Vocational Education

Thank you, Cal. I am very sorry that I was not here yesterday to meet with you as you pursued the problem of how to evaluate vocational education programs, and how best to prepare the annual reports of the Advisory Councils. As Cal mentioned, I do practice law, or try to, and I had to stay in Cleveland yesterday for that purpose. But I am glad to be here today because the enterprise in which we are all engaged is of particular importance at this point in history.

For quite a few years, vocational education has been in the background. Only recently have a great many people begun to see it as one of the facets of education which is most directly relevant to the problems the country faces. If you were writing your reports five years ago, I think that you would have found great difficulty in getting people to read them, much less take them seriously and act on them. But the situation has changed, and this year you will be addressing your reports to audiences in your State and elsewhere who are vitally interested in what you have to say.

I think you will find that the audience which today awaits your report is quite diverse. It consists of at least three main groups, the first of which includes a substantial number of very strong critics of vocational education. The other day Robert Worthington, one of our Council members, Dr. Dellefield, and I faced such a group. We were up on the Hill testifying before the Labor Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, and we got into quite a colloquy with Congressman Hawkins from Los Angeles. We contended that the school and community college people should be involved much more heavily in the planning of comprehensive manpower legislation than the Bill now pending in Congress contemplates. We also argued in favor of doing a large part of the career preparation job through mainstream institutions such as schools, community colleges, postsecondary and technical institutes, and so forth.

Hawkins came back to us and said, "Why do you think that institutions which have done such a bad job in the past of dealing with the problems of those who end up in the pool of unemployed are suddenly going to turn around and do a good job? Aren't you telling us to put our money and reliance with a group of people who have not shown that they can perform?"

We argued with the Congressman at some length and invited him to visit about eight cities to see what is going on. Nonetheless, it is clear from this and other similar conversations that there are a great many people who will be reading your reports who are convinced by what they consider persuasive evidence that vocational education is not responding to the challenge and that vocational educators are not doing a very good job. I think that we can include the present Administration in this group of people. This Administration does not think that vocational education has responded very well to the crisis of structural unemployment in the United States or to the problem of career preparation for people who find that education does not come easily to them. I think it is the view of Secretary Finch and Commissioner Allen, as well as of the White House, that they

are not going to put large sums of money into vocational education unless vocational educators perform more effectively than they have in the past.

A lot of this criticism is unjustified. Much of it is based on observations, not of the direction in which things are moving, but of the state in which things are now -- or, more accurately, were three or four years ago. In other words, I believe that many Congressmen and Federal government administrators are making policy decisions based upon the state of affairs that existed when they were last in the field several years ago.

This was the essence of what we told Congressman Hawkins. We suggested that if he would look, not at what he had seen when he had last gone around and looked at education, but at what is in process now and the changes that are taking place, at how many cities have embarked upon long-term programs to turn around their whole vocational education system, he would have quite a different view of how well vocational educators are responding and where government efforts should be put.

Another group which I think you will find in the audience which you are addressing is composed of people who totally reject these criticisms of vocational education and point to the magnificent job which vocational education did during the Second World War, when hundreds of thousands, maybe millions, of people were trained. This group measures the present performance of vocational education by the job it did 25 years ago when it was dealing with a totally different kind of problem. Their judgments are as inaccurate as those of Congressman Hawkins' group.

A third group, and one which comprises a very substantial part of your audience and is, I suspect over-represented in State departments of education and particularly in State departments of vocational education, is made up of people who are so concerned about the image of vocational education and about avoiding its being thought of as a program for kids who don't succeed, that they insist upon limiting vocational education to that narrow bracket of our population who will succeed no matter what they do. And this eliminates the disadvantaged.

In short, in your reports you will be talking to an audience which includes critics and, at the same time, people who are very defensive about vocational education. Some of those who are defensive have good reason for their attitude. They are making pretty good progress in grappling with problems and yet they have trouble persuading Congressman Hawkins and others like him to see what they are really doing. Others are defensive for reasons which are not so good. They are not really doing a very good job in vocational education, but they would like to think that they are, and therefore they define the problem in ways which make their present performance look better than it really is.

Now, trying to give information and advice to an audience as diverse as the one I have described will be a difficult assignment for all of us. There are a number of things, however, which I think we might do to make the task easier.

The first item on my list is one which I understand Congressman Quie spoke about at length yesterday, viz. that it is absolutely essential that the State Advisory Councils and the National Advisory Council be independent of the voca-

tional establishment if they are to perform the function that Congress and Secretary Finch want them to perform. As its first duty, every State Council must establish its independence from the State department of education. That does not mean that it become an angry and unseeing critic of the State department of education. What it means is that the State Council must have some kind of staff which is independent of the State department of education and it means that the Council must look for advice from people other than, or in addition to, those who work for the State department of education. It also means that at the same time that the Council establishes its independence of the State department of education it must remain equally independent of whatever other strong groups there may be within the State with axes to grind in vocational education. In other words, you can be captured by a professor, for example, who is trying to persuade his students and the public that the bureaucrats are doing a bad job, almost as easily as you can be captured by the bureaucrats. It is equally important to be independent of university and other critics as it is to be independent of the establishment.

The second point that seems important to me is that the State Councils and the National Council try to look at the big problems and not the minutia. It is very easy to get bogged down with the question of whether the latest set of guidelines which has been put out regarding the flow of information from the field to Washington is good or not. It is very easy to spend all six of your one-day meetings discussing whether or not the State Plan conforms to the policies established in Washington, or developing a lot of emotional heat about how the guidelines that have been worked out in Washington are impossible to live with.

But those kinds of things are not really what you are in business for. What you are in business for is to stand back and take a good look at career preparation in your State. Who is getting trained and who is not getting trained? Who is finding a job and who is not finding a job? Who is getting the kind of job that has upward mobility and who is not? What parts of the State are being neglected? What groups within the State are being neglected? Where is money being spent without much result coming back? What about the private training schools? Are they somehow incorporated into the State system or is there a kind of warfare going on between them and the public schools? How about the question of whether or not your board of regents and your State board of education are collaborating in some reasonable way? Is there an inbetween area that neither group is covering, or are both of them, as happens in many States, building essentially similar institutions to serve the same population with the result that there is a duplication of effort and energy, and a competition for people which hikes up the cost without similarly increasing the results?

In short, the important job of the Advisory Council is to take the broadest possible look at what the State is doing. The more detailed, daily concerns are the responsibility of the administrators, not the Council.

My third suggestion for your reports is that you hunt for facts that say something. The facts do not necessarily have to be complete. It is not the job of the Advisory Councils to catalogue annually the complete range of performance of the State in vocational education. But when you are talking to the kind of diverse audience that I have described, you have to present concrete facts if

you want to be taken seriously. Otherwise, those who like what you say will use it to reinforce their preconceived ideas, and those who don't like what you say will dismiss it as they have been dismissing similar statements from a great many people for a long time.

You can be much more persuasive with hard facts than with all sorts of generalities. A statement went around Washington this year, for example, pointing out that in the State of Illinois, Chicago was getting for the first time the number of dollars of Federal money it would be entitled to if you simply took the vocational money and allocated it on a per pupil basis in Illinois. This says a lot about how vocational money has been allocated in some States in this country in the past. The Chicago situation received a good deal of notice and drew attention to the question of how State plans really allocate resources. Facts about a particular high school can also be useful. East Technical High School in Cleveland, for example, is a terrible old Victorian building which is about to be replaced by something new and shiny. But even with the old facility, the fact is that the dropout rate in that school is about 55% in grades ten through twelve for the college preparatory students, while it is only 13% for the vocational students. This is the kind of statistical information that says something, and it is the kind of fact that the Advisory Councils ought to be looking for.

My fourth suggestion is that you be concise, clear and simple in your reports. If you try to say everything and deal with both sides of every issue, the people who read your report will find what they want in it and ignore everything else. The only way you will be heard is to figure out what you want to say, and then say it in such a way that people will not be able to escape your meaning. The capacity of people in government and elsewhere to extract from 45 pages the paragraph which supports their conclusion and ignore the rest is infinite. So, if you want to be understood, you have to eliminate all those qualifying paragraphs and simply state clearly and simply the point you want to get across.

I have one final suggestion, which is that if any of us are to be effective in any aspect of education, we have got to grapple with the problem of cost and where the money is going to come from. This is not one of the major responsibilities of State Advisory Councils, but, being concerned about education, you have also got to be concerned about the financing of vocational education.

The basic fact, I think, is that we are not going to have an adequate vocational education system in this country, nor are we going to deal adequately with a great number of other educational problems, until we deal with the question of finance. In my book, this means somehow finding a way to tie the cost of education into the yield of a progressive income tax. For a great many years, we have financed our highways by taking into account the fact that people who drive automobiles and buy gasoline are, on the whole, willing to pay money to build roads. Well, we have all the evidence about the relationship between educational level and earning capacity, but we haven't drawn from that the same conclusion that we have drawn in the field of transportation. The fact is that people who get an education tend to get more income and ought to be in a position to pay for that education through some kind of device which

harnesses income tax to the cost of education. The National Advisory Council is considering this problem and some of its members see a need for a National Education Act which will in some way tie the return from the Federal income tax to a comprehensive program of Federal support for education. Perhaps this could be done through an extension of the surcharge.

It seems to me that such a step is almost a necessity if we are to have good vocational education in the United States and I would urge that as you think about the problem of vocational education in your State, you take into consideration that vocational education costs a good deal more than college preparatory education. This is especially true if you take into account the increasing evidence that school services ought to be expanded to provide job placement counseling for all students who are not going to college, and a follow-up system for dropouts who leave school before they are 18, get a job permit, start work, and then quit. All this will cost substantial amounts of money. It does not do any good to recommend that your State go into the business of job placement for high school students unless you also face the problem of where the money is going to come from. This problem is a proper subject for your Agenda also.

I am looking forward to the rest of the day, and hope to catch up on all the things that you discussed yesterday. Thank you.

DR. JAMES G. ABERT, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR EVALUATION AND
MONITORING, H.E.W.

Remarks Before the Joint Meeting of the State
and National Advisory Councils on Vocational Education

I have prepared a short manuscript for my remarks. I have found that I am always reassured when I see a speaker with a prepared manuscript. This is because I have some confidence that the speaker will know when he has come to the end and will sit down. I assure you that these remarks will not take long and I will know when I have come to the end and I will sit down.

First off, I should tell you that I am an economist, not an educator. It is said economists tell us about the future, historians tell us about the past. It is only the present about which we are confused. I came to economics by way of mechanical engineering, as an undergraduate, and six years in the U.S. Navy, including several as engineer of a submarine. As you may know, no Officer serves on submarines who is not what you might call "vocationally" trained. Driving a submarine is not a white-collar desk job. For the record, I was one of the few people in the history of our local high school to "cross over" from the academic side substituting shop for ancient and world history. I can say in retrospect, with repairmen and carpenters costing what they do, it was a cost/effective decision.

My subject this morning is the role of the Advisory Councils in evaluation. You may detect in my remarks a certain bias toward measurement and quantification with emphasis on income and earnings. Economists have been accused of being willing to barter all that is heroic in life: honor, integrity, sovereignty, power and other sacred aspects of public undertakings, for materialism. I certainly believe we should measure what we can, but I reject the notion that because we do, that only these measurable aspects of a problem should be, or indeed will be, considered when decision making time is upon us.

In my judgment, evaluation illuminates the problem. It does not solve problems automatically. Evaluation does not make decisions. Hopefully, it aids decision makers. And, these decision makers are people--Congress, the Secretary, the Commissioner, the Bureau Chiefs, the Advisory Councils, and so on. I believe they can be relied on to take into account the non-economic, non-materialistic, aspects of a given situation. I do believe they can do this better if they have better information about those elements of the situation that can be measured; that is, those that can be quantified.

This brings me to an enumeration I have made of what I consider to be the main objectives of evaluation. There are four of these:

1. The first is to raise the level of information. Many of us talk a lot about the social issues of our time, but we are either not willing, or not able, to really find out much about them. Not all of us are researchers

and even if we were, not all of us have the time to research a single issue, let alone many issues. Nevertheless, I have found that most educated people, perhaps this is the mark of an educated man, are willing to accept facts once they are presented. Uncertainty about the facts seems to me to underly a great deal of our controversy. There is still the matter of interpretation. But, I believe that argument over interpretation represents progress. It's a higher order argument than those based on rhetoric, emotion and prejudice. Therefore I assert that the first objective of evaluation is to raise the level of information. I understand that without exception each Advisory Council is attempting to achieve this objective.

2. The second objective of evaluation deals with efficiency. Properly constructed, an evaluation framework leads to decisions. What do I mean by efficiency? I mean making the most out of the time busy people have to spend on an issue. Too often we do not approach a decision about policy or program in a structured way. Most of our time is spent in groping, trying to place fragmented and isolated pieces of information into a framework that will allow us to make a well-founded judgment about the preferred future course of action. Too often we make this decision not because we understand the problem, not because we have considered our alternatives thoroughly and have chosen the one that appeals to us the most, but rather, we make a decision because our time has run out, the hour is late, someone has to catch a plane, or you name it.

Properly structured, evaluation can:

- inform the decision maker on status and progress of programs
- illuminate the problem areas
- force the setting of targets
- demand a reckoning of progress toward the targets
- cause an examination of priorities
- suggest course of action
- enable creation of new alternatives
- guide research on areas important to decisions where information is now weak.

Out of this come decisions about objectives, processes and resource allocation. These are essential to the proper attainment of my final two objectives of evaluation.

3. The first of these is control of process and of allocation. The question is: How does the Council know the policy it has set, the process it has chosen, and the allocations it has suggested, are actually implemented? We all know of cases where the name gets changed, but the game doesn't. Or, even examples of where the resources have simply gone somewhere else.

Here I would suggest that a State Advisory Council should establish some sort of monitoring or investigating capacity, I think to be exercised on a random or ad hoc basis for the purpose of demonstrating the capacity to do it and to raise questions requiring more thorough investigation.

4. The final objective of evaluation is one of comparing results with objectives and of making changes in plans as a result of this comparison. In my judgment, an Advisory Council will be more effective if it delves into a selected set of issues in great depth and ignores others, than if it tries to spread itself out over every area that may demand its attention. In my view, to change tomorrow from what it would be, as a result of simple extrapolation based on today and yesterday, requires high level attention. Yet, too often, this attention gets dissipated over too many issues and does not impact sufficiently on anyone to really make changes take place. The critical mass, however defined, is simply not achieved.

Having said this, I feel I would be remiss if I did not indicate some areas of concentration for the Councils. That is, areas where they might direct their attention and cause appropriate staff work to be done by others and prepared for the Councils' review. Here are a few that seem important to me. I advance them for the sake of discussion. I don't mean to suggest that these are the only important issues, or even the most important ones. They may not match your priorities.

First, I think you should insist that your State conduct a major longitudinal study dealing with the question of preventive versus remedial manpower training. We should follow the employment and earning experiences of a sample of persons who have had particular kinds of educational and training experiences as they are affected by labor market conditions.

What kinds of information need to be gathered? First, descriptions of the educational and training experiences and their associated costs. This is the input side. On the output side the measures that would be needed include:

- time required to get the first full time job
- methods used to get the first full time job
- relatedness of first job to course studied
- reasons for failure to get jobs in field studied
- initial and terminal earnings on jobs held
- satisfaction ratings on jobs held
- relatedness of all jobs held to course studied
- employer stability since graduation
- earnings progression since graduation

- non-vocational measures reflecting personal growth

The objective here is to display the labor market experience, during the same time period, of persons of the same age with approximately the same background but differing in training received.

Incidentally, I would think that every Advisory Council report should attempt a summary and projection of labor market conditions in the State, its major cities and in its major industries. Certainly this bears on any reports that are made concerning employment and earnings of recent or past graduates (dropouts) from the vocational curriculum.

In summary, I think the remedial versus preventive question is one where the advisory board can contribute to raising the level of information and is perhaps one where only through its intervention will it be possible to see that the necessary resources are applied to get some hard facts.

The second area of concentration where I suggest an Advisory Council might pay close and indepth attention is the lowering of barriers to entry into the teaching profession--at the higher levels. This is an area susceptible to quantification, where targets can be set and achievement can be measured.

My final area for intense study by the Advisory Board concerns attitudes of students and parents toward vocational education. Here I suggest that the Council take steps to establish baseline survey data. In addition, the Council should, in my opinion, take the lead in selecting programs designed to change these attitudes and then to cause these programs to be implemented in selected areas of the State for the purpose of determining "what, if anything, works." I would hope that research and development funds would be available to support this type of activity. Here again I feel that the Advisory Council will have to act as the catalyst for this type of evaluation activity, or else I am not sure it will take place.

What I am suggesting might be called "management by exception." I am suggesting that the Councils use their evaluative role to home-in on a number of priority issues and thereby to cause others to devote their attention to them. That the Councils make these issues their own, and that they spend their scarce time on the review of only these particular issues. In doing this the Council should cause targets to be set, programs initiated, and progress to be reckoned. Therefore, the Council serves as a catalyst and the focal point for activity in these areas. Other areas where, in my judgment, the Council can serve as catalyst, include:

The determination of State and local "fair" shares for vocational education vis-a-vis academic or general education. This involves the whole idea of comparability of services, substitution, supplement versus supplant, and so forth.

The Council can also serve as the channel wherein research findings developed elsewhere get bucked up against the

local (State) establishment. The "should we try this" kind of question has a lot more impact if the Secretary asks it than if some GS-12 down in the Bureau does. It's important, however, not to lose sight of the "should we" terminology. Hopefully it won't become "we should" rather than "should we." Sometimes I find that it's the communications system that is responsible for much of the hate and discontent between various parts of an organization. It happens because "should we" becomes "we should," as it gets passed down through various echelons of government.

I might insert here a few words on the optimum amount of evaluation. Evaluation can become counterproductive. One way is for it to generate so much distrust and loss of confidence that it has a negative effect on performance. The problem is how to evaluate this state of affairs when something "new" is being tried. We are all aware of the natural defensive, even threatened, attitude most of us have to new and different ways of doing things. That is not the way we did it in the past; therefore, it is not a way with which we feel comfortable, and it is not a way we accept without resistance.

There is an analogy here between my office and the activity of the State Advisory Council. In my office, we are trying to facilitate throughout the Department the attainment of an independent, hopefully objective, view of the success or failure of HEW programs. I hope we are astute enough not to confuse ignorance with objectivity. I understand some question this. We have managed to stir up a little controversy. How much of this is due to a natural distrust of a new way of doing business, and how much is well-founded in that what we are doing is dead wrong, or at the least represents an incorrect weighting of its positive and negative impacts, I really can't tell. I think only time will tell.

I judge from reading your newsletter and some of your working papers, particularly as far as your budget problems are concerned and the problems some of you have had using consultants, that the analogy between what we are doing and what you are doing is pretty close.

A final note on evaluation. You do it to make better decisions. It costs a lot. It should improve decision making commensurate with its costs. It should not be done just for education, nor because it gives you a good feeling to know you are on top of the problem. You should spend your resources, and they are very limited, in areas where you expect to get your larger payoffs. This is one reason why I favor concentration of resources on a few problems where you, because of your strategic position, might be able to change tomorrow. If you don't, from your vantage point, who will? The Nation's record of change from within any of its institutions, is very poor. Hopefully, education can be an exception; if not as catalyst, at least as far as receptivity is concerned.

Evaluation, properly used, can be your tool to determine if change is needed, where it is needed, to choose among your alternative change agents, to monitor the process, and finally, closing the loop, to evaluate the results. Good luck and thank you for your attention.

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS TO DR. JAMES ABERT

Question: How would you go about getting a cost-effectiveness analysis of prevention versus remediation in job training?

Response: We are trying to do this now on a national level. About a year ago, the Office of Economic Opportunity, in conjunction with the Labor Department, funded a longitudinal study of five manpower training programs. The study, which will cost around three or four million dollars, will follow a group of trainees through their training programs and over 18 months after training has been completed. Ten cities will be included in the study. The idea is to compare the costs and training processes of people in the labor market during the next 18 months, with others of the same age who are being followed through the five manpower programs. Their performance in the labor market will be compared, as will their education and the cost of that education.

Question: You suggested that evaluation focus on one or two problems and not try to evaluate everything about vocational education in the State. Does this mean that any one of the goals which we approved yesterday could be an in-depth study?

Response: If you do an overall evaluation of vocational education in your State, you will end up year after year Xeroxing the same report from last year and changing the numbers. If you use your energy wisely on a few things, and take your problems on in sequence, rather than simultaneously, you may look back on your time in office and say, "I have really done something."

Question: Do you think we should study what is causing public attitudes towards vocational education, and try to improve these attitudes?

Response: First, you should get some baseline data, which describes these attitudes in such a way that changes can be measured. I believe you can have people come to you with ideas about what causes these attitudes and how they may be changed. Then the changes can be measured.

Question: Is the Office of Education planning anything along these lines?

Response: Not that I know of, but I really can't speak for all their activities.

Question: You made a statement about reducing the qualifications of instructors in vocational-technical education. Would you elaborate further on that?

Response: I am addressing the issue of certification. I am not really sure there is a one to one correspondence between certification and qualification. It seems to me that there are people qualified to teach who can't get certified to teach, and that we ought to look into that a bit.

Question: We are getting somewhere around \$70 per student in vocational education. Manpower programs are spending between \$600 and \$1500 per student just for training, not including some subsistence. Given these figures, how can you make a fair comparison between manpower and vocational education? We wonder about all this money for evaluations if we haven't spent a comparable amount for the education process.

Response: I tried to make the point that evaluation is costly. This is OEO money, and it is supposed to be used for this kind of study. I realize that you can fritter away an awful lot of money collecting meaningless numbers, especially when you go to broad based management information systems which try to report on everything. But, I personally think the issue at stake here is a very large one and that the money spent on this study is a good investment.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION RELATED TO DR. ABERT'S REMARKS

With regard to certification of teachers, some of the delegates suggested that the real problem was on the financial level, not the certification level. A qualified auto mechanic, for example, can be certified to teach, but he will earn less teaching than he would in a garage, and he will earn less than the college graduate teaching English. Until this problem is resolved, certification is a rather minor issue.

There was concern expressed about the longitudinal study on preventative versus remedial training because of the number of variables involved. A person who has been in an MDTA program and one who has been in a vocational program cannot be compared, for example, without taking into consideration why the first did not begin training until after his school years, while the latter did. In short, such a study would involve not just a comparison of two training systems, but of entire economic situations.

One problem which has faced vocational education is the attitude in many school districts which says that unless there is a subsidy for vocational education, it will not be provided. In general, school districts use their funds to provide education for the average student, not the student who needs something special which will be more expensive. There is a need for more subsidies, but also a need to convince school districts to implement vocational education programs even where no subsidy exists. The other problem connected with subsidies is the limitations which they place on the type of education which can be provided. The National Advisory Council is looking into this problem to see how a sensible subsidy can be developed which will get away from the idea that the State will pay the extra cost of hiring a vocational teacher, but will only let that teacher provide strictly vocational instruction which does not include basic reading, arithmetic, etc.

One possible remedy for this situation is the Letson Plan for financing vocational education. Under this plan, for every student who participates in vocational education programs, the State and Federal governments would pay a portion of the extra cost of preparing the student as opposed to a college preparatory student. Subject to satisfying the State and Federal agencies with the results of the vocational program, there would be no guidelines on what methods, curricula, etc. must be used in the training. This would allow the school district to select which programs it wants to finance, as long as results are being achieved.

Many students who study vocational education go on to college; in fact many receive their motivation for further academic study in the vocational education programs. The Advisory Council should evaluate the impact on attitudes and goals as related to experiences in vocational education programs. The Advisory Councils should also show interest in finding ways to tie business and industry into vocational education programs in terms of employment opportunities. Vocational education cannot be totally effective for minority youngsters, for example, as long as discrimination exists in employment.

The control over the expansion and effectiveness of vocational education has rested with the general education system, with legislators, with community attitudes, and with industry to the extent that industry is a powerful interest group in the community. It has not, strictly speaking, rested mainly with the vocational educators. In most cases, vocational education programs have never been designed and properly staffed to do the enormous job which has been expected of them. This has caused a lot of negative attitudes toward vocational education--attitudes which hopefully will be changed by the Advisory Councils' efforts to influence public opinion with regard to vocational education programs.

In his speech, Dr. Abert stressed the necessity of isolating and working with a limited number of major issues. One of these might be what should be done to prepare a student so that he has the basic education to satisfactorily participate in a vocational education program. It might also be a good idea in terms of evaluation, to have some fairly structured evaluation procedures designed--more structured than those passed yesterday--to make sure that each State concentrates on issues of general importance.

DR. CALVIN DELLEFIELD, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NACVE

Concluding Remarks

Since last November, when we sat half a mile away in another hotel and had very little idea where we would go or what we would do, or what our role would be, we have moved ahead significantly. First of all, we have found out that the States do have problems. And we have found out that many of the problems which are found in one State are not unique, but rather are similar to those experienced in other States. This makes it easier for us to see where we should focus our attention to obtain maximum results. We have also found out that there are good vocational education programs in operation, and we have found that there are ways of implementing similar programs in our own States.

I think that one of the main strengths of this meeting has been our ability to concentrate on ideas, problems and potential solutions which can now be taken back to the individual States. This has been a meeting which has really focused on what each State will be doing in the next several months. Many of you have told me about what can be done by lay people working cooperatively on a State Council with the professionals, and how this type of mutual cooperation has increased substantially in the past six months. The key will be what we do in the next six months. Will our evaluations point out the critical areas for consideration in the States? Will they point out the problems and strengths that you find? Will they be, as Dr. Abert said earlier, the basis for a gigantic effort to make vocational education what it should be in each State, and therefore in all of the fifty States, the territories and the nation? Will the attention of the people in each State be focused upon the opportunities that are available for their children and for themselves? This is what we have talked about and this is what we are going to try to do.

On behalf of the National Council staff and the National Council, I wish to congratulate you on what you have been able to do in a very few months with practically no money, but with a tremendous amount of dedication and effort. I would also like to thank you for being here in Washington for this meeting. I would like to receive your suggestions as to the Ad Hoc Committee and other areas where you would like the National Council to be of assistance. In that way we will try to carry out cooperatively the mandate of this group.

Delegates in Attendance

Alabama

Mrs. Dorothy Chambers

Alaska

Louis J. Licari, Chairman, SAC

Arkansas

Daniel Woods, Chairman, SAC
Frank Troutman, Executive Director

California

Karl W. Kolb, Executive Director
Melvin L. Barlow

Colorado

Stow Witwer, Chairman, SAC
Irwin MacKay, Executive Director

Connecticut

Mrs. Kathleen Tracy, Chairman, SAC
Mrs. Adeline Solomon

Delaware

Mrs. Martha Bachman, Chairman, SAC
G. B. McGorman, Executive Director

District of Columbia

Frank Gregory, Chairman, SAC
Bill G. Evans

Florida

Walter Clausen, Chairman, SAC
W. Bruce Howell, Executive Director

Georgia

Charles McDaniel, Chairman, SAC

Hawaii

George Escher, Chairman, SAC
Robert Toothman, Executive Director

Illinois

William Nagel, Executive Director

Indiana

James Fallace, Chairman, SAC
Robert Hewlett

Iowa

James Bowman, Chairman, SAC
Hanlon Giese, Executive Director

Kansas

Murle Hayden, Executive Director
T. R. Palmquist

Kentucky

William Howard, Executive Director

Louisiana

Vernon Galliano, Chairman, SAC
Curtis Bradshaw
Wade Davis
Thomas Derveloy

Maine

Randall Nichols

Maryland

Max Jobe, Executive Director

Massachusetts

Joseph Martorana, Chairman, SAC

Michigan

Joseph Tuma, Chairman, SAC

Minnesota

Burleigh Saunders, Chairman, SAC
T. Jerome Enright, Executive Director
William Lawrence
Donald Crassweller
Chynne Koser

Mississippi

James Easom, Executive Secretary
James Wall

Missouri

Billy Bruns

Montana

Linda Skaar

Nebraska

Lawrence Wm. McVoy, Chairman, SAC
C. A. Cromer, Executive Director
William Ptacek

Nevada

R. Courtney Riley, Executive Director

New Hampshire

Andrew Moynihan, Executive Director
Carroll Sanderson

New Jersey

J. W. Helmstaedter, Chairman, SAC

New Mexico

Connie Jordan, Executive Secretary

New York

John Briscoe, Executive Director

North Carolina

Joe Clary, Executive Director

North Dakota

Deforest Rall, Executive Director
Treedwell Havgen

Ohio

Warren Weiler, Executive Director
Jesse Fulton

Oklahoma

Larry Hansen, Executive Director
Mrs. H gh R. Hughes
Roy Stewart

Oregon

Frank Bachman, Executive Secretary

Pennsylvania

Severino Stefanon, Executive Director

Puerto Rico

A. Figueroa, Chairman, SAC

Rhode Island

William Carroll, Jr. Chairman, SAC
Daniel Spaight, Jr., Executive Director

South Carolina

Robert Harley, Chairman, SAC
Robert White, Executive Director
Floyd Johnson

South Dakota

Glenn Barnes, Chairman, SAC

Tennessee

F. R. Thornton, Chairman, SAC
W. M. Garrison, Executive Director

Texas

E. D. Redding, Chairman, SAC
Alton D. Ice, Executive Director

Utah

Robert Halladay, Chairman, SAC
Rulon Garfield

Vermont

Pelton Goudley, Chairman, SAC
Richard Collins, Executive Director

Virginia

Rufus Beamer, Chairman, SAC
Arthur Walker, Executive Director

Washington

Robert Wallenstien, Chairman, SAC
Richard Anderson, DECA

West Virginia

Rob Roy Walters, Chairman, SAC
James A. Cross, Executive Director

Wisconsin

John (Nick) Kramer, Chairman, SAC
Mrs. William Nielsen

Wyoming

M. Dale Ensign, Chairman, SAC

NACVE

Hugh Calkins, Chairman
Calvin Dellefield, Executive Director
Michael Alarid
Richard G. Allen
W. E. Lowry
Jack Michie
Luis M. Morton
Charles F. Nichols